

A FULL REPLY

To certaine brieve
Observations and Anti-Queries

ON
Master PRYNNEs twelve Questions, about
Church-Government:

Wherein the Frivolousnesse, Falsenesse, and
grosse Mistakes of this Anonymous Answerer (ashamed
of his Name) and his weak grounds for Independency,
and Separation, are modestly discovered,
refuted.

Together with certaine brieve *Animadversions* on Mr. John Goodwins
Theomachia, in justification of *Independency examined*, and of the
Ecclesiasticall Jurisdiction and Rights of Parlia-
ment, which he fights against.

By William Pryne of Lincolnes Inne, Esquire.

Socrates Scholasticus Eccles. Hist. l. 5. c. 20.

*Ecclesia cum semel esset divisa, non una divisione acquisivit, sed homines ab se mu-
tuo averti, alter ab altero denud secesserunt; atque adeo EXIGVAM LE-
VICVLAMQVE OCCASIONEM nati, mutue communionis
consociationisque vincula disruperunt.*

Have salt in your selves, and have peace one with another. Mark 2. 50.

To this end was I born, and for this cause come I into the world, that I should beare
witness unto the truth. Ioh. 18. 37.

Am I therefore become your enemy, because I tell you the truth? Gal. 4. 16.

Imprimatur. October 14. 1644

John White.

The second Edition seen: what enlarged, with materiall Additions.

London, Printed by F. L. for Michael Sparke Senior, and are to be sold
at the Blew-Bible in Green-Arbour. 1644.

Eccles. 4. 4.



F all the *vanities and vexations of spirit*, enumerated by the royal Preacher, this is one of the principall, [a] *That for all travel, and every right work, a man is envied* (yea, many times hated, oppugned) *by his neighbour*. This hath been alwayes my condition heretofore and now; my *best actions and publike services* for the common good, have been misconstrued, traduced, nay censured in an high degree, *as evil*, by many; though (blessed be God) approved, yea gratefully accepted by the best-affected to the Church and State.

Gal. 4. 16.

The importunity of some *Reverend friends*, lamenting the *deplorable distractions of our Church*, which threaten disunion, and so ruine to us, in these unhappy times of intestine warres, prevailed so farre, as to induce me to compile and publish *Twelve considerable serious questions touching Church-government*; out of a cordial desire (as much as in me lay) to close up, not widen our divisions. Which though they have given ample satisfaction to many truly religious, of all ranks and qualities, who have returned me speciall thanks; yet they have found very *harsh entertainment* from others, who of *Friends* [b] *are become my professed Antagonists* (if not *enemies*) in print; *because I have told them the truth*: to whom I should have returned no *Reply* but silence (there being nought in these *Observations* worthy answer) but only to rectifie some mistakes therein and shew the opposite party those common errors wherby they deceive themselves and others.

E. Page 1. 2.

The first thing this namelesse Respondent quarrels with, is [c] *For my writing by way of Quere*; To which I answer, that I had both *Presidents* and *Reasons* for it.

* Luk. 2. 46;
47. Mat. 11. 1
to 20. c. 12. 3;
to 13. 26, 27;
29. c. 21. 23, to
43. c. 22. 18, to
23. c. 16, 26.

Presidents, from our *Saviour* himselfe, who *both instructed, refused, convinced his opposites and auditors by demanding* * *Questions only*. *Presidents* from *Philosophers, Fathers, School-men, and all sorts of Writers*, ancient, modern, over-tedious to recire.

Reasons: 1. I conceived the *Questions* touching church-government were not rightly stated by most; and that the right stating of them by way of *Question*, would be the best and speediest meanes to decide them. 2. The Independent party had neither then, nor since (to my knowledg) dogmatically resolved or discovered in print, what that church-government is they so eagerly contend for, and pretend to be so plainly set downe in the Word of God (being not yet all agreed what they hold, or should desire, except it be this, to be left at free libertie to doe what they please) and therefore I conjectured such *Queries* to be the only means to discover and refute their concealed Platform. 3. The controversies concerning church-government, were then and now in agitation in the *Synod* and high Court of *Parliament*, the properest Judges of them; therefore I thought it better became me in point of modesty and good manners, to expresse my opinion of them by way of *Question*, then *Decision*. Finally, I found all *Independents* guilty of *Petitio principii*, in their Writings, Sermons, Discourses, peremptorily concluding their form of church-government, to [d] *be the onely Government instituted by Christ, the onely way of God, which hath more of God and Christ in it then any other; the Kingdom, Scepter, and Throne of Christ himselfe, and no other way beside it*; [e] *That by the beauty and perfect consonancy of this Government with the Word of God, it may very reasonably* (yea and upon higher terms then of reason) *be thought, that in time it cannot but overthrow all sorts of Ecclesiasticall government* (and I fear civill too by the self-same reason, *it stand up it self in their head*, which they close up with a *Faxi Deum & festiner*: and, that writt g or

3 The Apolo-
geticall Nar-
ration, Mr.
Symphon.
A Reply of
two of the Bre-
thren, with
others.
e A Reply of
two of the Bre-
thren to A. S.
p. 111.

disputing

disputing against this Government, or opposing it in any kind, yea in thought, is no lesse then [f] A FIGHTING AGAINST GOD, which will bring certain ruine on our Realme in generall, and all private, open opposers of it: yet not one of them (nor this Respondent) hath hitherto fully discovered to us, what this *WAR* or Government is; nor produced any one Scripture or Reason to warrant these superlative *Encomiums* of it, but we must take all they say as Gospel, upon their owne bare words, without examination or dispute: And therefore I proposed these, with 12 other subsequent Questions to them, to induce them to make good these transcendent (that I say not arrogant) Positions touching their Way; since I seriously professe before God, Angels, and men, that I could never yet discover the least footsteps of it in Scripture, or Antiquity, nor descry this their Patern in the Mount, which no age till ours had ever the happiness to behol'd, if it be worth the viewing, when unveiled by them to us.

Having thus given this Respondent the true grounds of my writing by way of Question, I shall briefly answer all his materiall Observations and Anti-queries upon my twelve Questions, pretermittting his Impertinencies.

1. To the first Question the Respondent gives no Answer at all to the things demanded, but only misrecites the Question, without my limitations; and then seemes to refute, what himselfe propounds, not I: He should have demonstrated by direct Scriptures, That Christ hath prescribed one set immutable forme of Government to all Christian Nations, Churches in the World, from which none must vary in the least degree, without sinne, schisme, or being no true Churches of Christ, with whom good Christians may with safe conscience communicate; and that nothing herein is, or can be left free to humane prudence, (though themselves most stitily plead, that Christ hath prescribed no set form of praying or preaching to Ministers, people, but left all men free to use their liberty and severall gifts in both; on which grounds they condemne all set forms of publike (if not private) prayers, (and some of them the use of the Lords owne prayer) together with there ading of set Homilies; upon which very grounds they must also deny all set formes of church-government, as well as of Prayer and Preaching:) And then have positively delineated, exactly proved the modell of this pretended Government, Discipline, in every particle thereof, by Gospel-Texts, so far as to satisfie mens erroneous judgments, consciences herein, that so they might either submit thereto without dispute, or propound their objections against the same. But in this maine point (whereon the hinge of the controversie turnes) the Respondent is wholly silent, and I shall expect his answer ad *Gracias Calendas*. Only lest he might seem to say nothing, he endeavours to prove, that there is a set forme of Church-government prescribed by Christ in the Gospel, not by direct Texts, but from pretended absurdities of his owne fancying, (for which he can produce no Text nor Reason) wherein he hath prevaricated, and shewes himselfe absurd.

First, (writes he) if this were granted (that there is no such set form of Church-government prescribed to all) the Gospell would be *straiter then the Law, Christ more unsatisfull then Moses. If we deny these absurd consequences, you shall have these sound proofes of both subjoined; God set a patterne to *Moses of a carnal Temple, (you mistake good Sir, it was a Tabernacle, and that not carnall) which he charged him not to vary from in a tittle: (well, I grant it, because you produce *two full Scriptures for it) Ergo, he hath prescribed a set pattern of Church-government and Discipline to all Christian Nations, Churches in the new Testament, from which

* It seemes to me a kinde of contradiction, to asserst one unalterable set forme of Church-government, and yet to condemne all set formes of Common Prayer or Preaching: Prayer and Preaching being more essentiall to a Church, then meere Government or Discipline.

* I should say freer, where the government is left arbitrary. Exod. 25. 40. Heb. 8. 5.

they must not vary in one tittle. If he (or any other) can shew me such a pattern as he contends for, so clearly delineated to us in the new Testament, as that pattern of the Tabernacle God shewed *Moses* was in the old, and then produce as direct precepts enjoining all Christians, Republics, Churches, not to vary from it in one tittle, as *Moses* had not to vary from his, I shall beleieve his sequell; till then I shall deeme it a true Independent argument, and as grosse a Non-sequitur as this, which necessarily followes upon the concession of it.

God shewed and prescribed to *Moses* the expresse pattern or fashion of *Aarons* and his Sons garments, ornaments, under the Law, *Exod. 28.*

Ergo he hath likewise shewed and prescribed the expresse pattern, fashion, and colour, of all Bishops, Presbyters, Ministers garments, ornaments under the Gospel, (most likely in the Roman Ceremoniall and Pontificall.) If the one consequence be ridiculous, the other must needs be so.

But to quell this your principall Argument, First, the patterne in the mount was meant onely of the materials, forme, vessels and utensils of the Tabernacle, not of the Government and Discipline of the Iewish church; therefore very impertinent to prove a settled Church-government, Discipline, under the Gospel. Secondly, it was shewed only to *Moses*, the temporall Magistrate and chief Ruler of the Israelites; not to *Aaron*, or any private Independent Priest or Synagogue of the Iewes; yea *Moses* (not they) was to make, or see all things made according to the pattern in the mount; Ergo (if there be any consequence from this patterne) not the Independent Minister or congregation, but Kings, chief temporall Magistrates, and Parliaments (the supreme civill Powers, Councils, are likewise (under the Gospel) to prescribe and set up such a church-government as is agreeable to Gods Word: as *Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Hezekiah, Josiah, Nehemiah, and other godly Princes, Governours*, with their Parliaments or generall Assemblies did under the Law: And then what becomes of your Independent Ministers, Congregations claimes to this Sovereigne temporall jurisdiction, (a part of Christs Kingly office, delegated onely to Kings, and highest temporall powers) which was never conferred on them? In fine, if there be any such expresse unalterable divine patterne of church-government under the Gospel, I pray informe me, why it was not as punctually, as particularly described in the new Testament, as the forme of the Tabernacle, of its materials with all the services, ornaments, appurtenances of it, and of the Temple were under the Law? Nay, why was the Tabernacle altered into a Temple, different from it? and why did the second Temple vary from the first, and that in the self same Church and Nation? If these were patterns of the church-government under the Gospel, and yet varied, altered successively in this manner; then by consequence the Government, Discipline under the Gospel is variable, alterable too, and so not fixed, nor immutable.

His second Argument, That Christ should neither be faithfull as a husband, head, nor King of his Church, if he should give others power to order it as they pleased to their owne civill Government, not setting downe his owne Lawes for them to walke by, is both a fallacy & absurdity. There is no man doubts but that Christ in the Scriptures (which some of you refuse to heare read in our Churches, though* publike reading of them be Gods owne ordinance) hath prescribed to us all necessary Rules Lawes both for our faith, lives either in a general or special manner which I must pursue. But that he hath punctually or particularly set down any exact

† I hope you will not argue, Carpenters, Maions, Goldsmiths, and other Artificers, not Priests or Ministers, under the Law built the Tabernacle and material Temple, Ergo, they onely, not Ministers, ought now under the Gospel to build the Church and spirituall Temple: this would be but bad Logick, and worse Divinity.
* 2 Chron. c. 3. to 2.
† Ezra 3. 10.
12. Hag. 2. 3.
10. 10.
* Exod 24. 7.
Deut. 31. 11.
Iosh. 8. 34.
2 Kings 23. 2.
2 Chro. 34. 30.
Neh. 8. 3, &c
c. 9. 3. c. 15. 1.
Jer. 36. 6. to 24
Luke 4. 16.
Act. 13. 15. 27
c. 15. 21. 31.
Col. 4. 16
1 Thes. 5. 27.

unalterable

unalterable form of church-government, for all Christian Nations, Churches to follow, under pain of being unfaithfull in all the former respects; and that the Independent Modell alone is that very patterne (the onely point in question) remains on your part to make good. A man may be a faithfull husband, King, Master, Father, though he prescribe not distinct particular Lawes, to regulate each particular action of his Wife, Subjects, Servants, Children: * *Let all things be done decently and in order,* (a generall rule for church-government) is sufficient to excuse Christ from these your presumptuous reproaches, and regulate all particulars, though left indefinite, as well as this generall Rule for our Christian conversation, *Phil. 1. 27. Let your conversation be as becometh the Gospel of Christ:* and this order for our speech, *Eph. 4. 29. Let no corrupt communication come out of your mouth, but that which is good to the use of edifying.* You may as well charge Christ with unfaithfulness, for not prescribing to us a generall Liturgy, or every particular action we should doe, every word we should speak, or Ministers preach upon any occasion, as for not prescribing a particular forme of church-government.

His third Argument, that *Rev. 11. 1, 2. we read of a † measuring of the Temple;* † Belike the and *Rev. 21. 1, 2. of the new Jerusalem coming downe from God out of heaven* prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; Ergo there is a setled divine church-government universally prescribed to all Christians in the new Testament; is no better a prooffe of this assertion, then the Angel of the Church of Ephesus, is of our Prelats Lordly hierarchy *jure divino*. He might as well, yea more properly have concluded thence, That the Altar was measured as well as the Temple, *Rev. 11. 1.* (referring only to the * Jewish nor christian Church, which hath no * Temple nor Altar:.) Ergo we ought to have an Altar, yea one divine set form of Altars in all christian Churches under the Gospel: which I hope you dare not aver.

After these three Independent Arguments, he pretends my third Quere contradicts the first, because I suppose a church-government may be consonant to Gods Word in the generall, which is not particularly prescribed in it: A pretty fancy! As if nothing could be consonant to Gods Word, which is not particularized or verbally enjoyed in it: Are not our materiall churches, garments, temporall Magistrates, Majors, Corporations, Parliaments, Courts of justice, Laws of all sorts, yea Festivals, Covenants, monthly Fast, &c. agreeable to Gods Word, because not literally prescribed in it? Are your private church-covenants, unmixt Communions (as you phrase them,) erections of Independent congregations without the licence of temporall Magistrates, not consonant to the Word in your owne opinions, though no where extant in it? If not, then all your divine pretences for them vanish, and you yeeld your cause: If yea, you must then recant this pretence of a contradiction, till you are able to prove it better then yet you have done.

Having played the Logicians and contradictors part so well, he next betakes himself to his Anti-queries to prove a set church-modell: which are three.

1. *If no prescript forme (of church-government) in the Word, why not Episcopacy (especially regulated and moderated) as well as Presbytery?*

I answer, if you meane it of Lordly Episcopacy, there are abundant pregnant Texts against it, to prove it opposite to Gods Word. If of moderated or regulated Episcopacy, the same with Presbytery: if the Parliament by the Synods advice unanimously establish it, as most consonant to the Scriptures, and most agreeable to the civill Government, I shall readily submit unto it without op-

position, and why not you and all others?

2. *If church-government be suited to States, whether Politicians are not more fit to consult about establishing it? Why is an Assembly of Divines called to search the Word about it?*

Answer, that my position is, *That every church-government ought to be suitable to Gods Word, as likewise to the civill State*; Therefore Politicians and Statesmen are fit to be consulted with, to suit it best to the civill State; and an Assembly of Divines, to square it likewise by and to the Word: the true reason why in this our Realme, and all other Christian States (as I can abundantly manifest if need be) Ecclesiasticall Lawes and formes of government have ever been settled by Parliaments, with the advice of Synods, Councils, wherein Statesmen and Church-men have jointly concurred in their deliberations and votes, using both the Bible and the Law to settle it, and not throwing either of them aside, as incompatible, as ignorant or lawlesse persons deeme them, but joyning both together: *True civill or ecclesiasticall Policy, skill in Government, Arts, wholsome Lawes, bringt Gods gift, as well as spirituall graces.*

† 2 Chron. I.
10, 11, 12

* 1 Kin. 3 5^o
to 15

Exod. 35:30

to 35.c.36.1,

to 5.c.31.3, to

7. Deut. 1.17

c.2.21, 22, 23.

But very
unreasonable
that Christ,
the Church,
State, Synod,
Parliament,
should be
subject to
your dictates,
not you to
theirs.

† 1 Tim. 6.15

Rev. 17.14

c.19.16.

* This Rule
holds firm in
all Church-
assemblies,
Synods, Par-
liaments, ele-
ctions by suf-
frages what-
soever. See
3. H. 8. c. 27

To his third *Anti-querie* Answer, *That it is more reasonable the State should be subject to Christs rule, then Christ to its direction*: But this *Querie* is quite besides the Question, till you prove infallibly, *That Christ hath prescribed a set unalterable divine government, to which all churches, Nations, States, must necessarily conform*; and clearly manifest what this Government is in all its particulars. Till this be done the sole question is, *Whether christian Princes, Parliaments, States, Synods, under the Gospel, have not a lawfull power to prescribe Ecclesiasticall Lawes and formes of Government, not repugnant to the Word, nor (to Christ himself, as you pretend, who is † King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, above the reach or command of humane power) but to all particular Christian churches, congregations, subjects under their respective jurisdictions? and whether the whole representative Church and State of England in Parliament, have not sufficient authority by Gods law to over-rule and bind all, or any particular members or congregations of it, as well as the major part of an Independent congregation, power to over-vote and rule the lesser part, and to order, yea bind any of their particular members?* A truth so clear, that no rationally man, good Christian or Subject can deny it: Your prime argument then, wherewith you deceive poore silly people, *That Kings, Parliaments, cannot prescribe Lawes and Canons to Christ himselfe, the Sovereigne Lord and King of his Church*; Ergo, they cannot prescribe them to their Christian subjects and Churches, who by Christs owne ordinance are subject to their lawfull soveraigne authority, is pure Independent Non-sence; much like this; A Matter, Father, cannot prescribe Lawes, Rules to the King or Parliament, who are paramount him: Ergo not to his servants, children, who are subject to him. As for the latter part of this *Querie*, *That the Saints thinke CHRIST is King alone over his Churches; and hath not left them to substitutes, and the politicke considerations of men to be governed by*; If hee meanes it onely of matters of Faith, or of mere internal government over the soules of men, it may passe as tolerable; but if hee intends it of externall Ecclesiasticall Government, Discipline, or order in the Church, or State as Christian, hee must renounce his Oath of Allegiance, his late Protestation, Nationall Vow and Covenant, and make Rom. 13.1, to 6.1. Pet. 2.13, 14. Tit. 3.1. 1 Tim. 2.1, 2, 3. to be Apocryphall; the Confessions of all Protestant Churches heretodox; and deny christian Kings, Magistrates, highest

highest civill powers, to be Christs substitutes, Vicars, in point of Government, (to whom Christ hath delegated his * *Kingly power*) as truly as Ministers are his deputies in point of instruction, admonition, to whom he hath bequeathed his Prophetical office.

* 2 Chro. 9. 8
2 Sam. 23. 3
Deut. 1. 17
2 Sam. 5. 2
Rom. 13. 1, 2
4, 6.

2.

+ Your party are most guilty of it, who without discovery or proof of your New-way, will have us blindly to submit unto it as the onely way of Christ.
* 1 Cor. 13.

3, 7

2. In his answer to my second *Quere*, he first wilfully misrecites it, then infers † *a blind obedience from it to all superiours commands, be they never so unjust or contrary to Gods Word*; whereas my *Question* speaks onely of *lawfull decrees, &c. consonant to Gods Word, and to the civill Lawes, Government, and manners of the people*; to which every Christian in point of conscience is bound to submit, (without any danger of *blinde obedience*) by the expresse resolution of *Rom. 13. 1, to 6. 1 Pet. 2. 14, 15. Tit. 3. 1. Ezra 7. 26. Josh. 1. 16, 17, 18. Heb. 13. 17*. If any man deny this verity, he must renounce not onely his *Christianity*, but his *Allegiance* and *Humanity* too. But suppose (saith he) *the whole Parliament and Synode should erre in commanding a Government that is erroneous or untrue, must we then submit unto it*? I answer, first, such an oversight is not to be presumed before it be actually committed; and it is neither * *christian, charitable, nor any way of Christ*, thus to *prejudge their resolutions*. Secondly, if the Decrees or Government they establish be not directly against Gods Word, nor pernicious to our soules, though not altogether such as we could wish, yet we ought contentedly to submit unto it without opposition: If contrary to the Word, we must then *passively* submit thereto for the present, and expect a redresse in Gods due time. But if it be such a Government and Discipline, under which we may freely enjoy the sincere and powerfull preaching of the Word, the due administration of the Sacraments, and all other Ordinances of God necessary for our salvation and edification, (as we may doubtlesse do under a Presbytery, and that government our pious Parliament intends to settle) we ought cordially and cheerfully to submit thereto; yea thankfully to embrace and blesse God for it, and can neither waiwardly oppugne nor refuse submission to it, without *arrogancy, contumacy, and apparent schisme*. As for his question concerning *my owne and fellow-brethrens sufferings*, (which we deeme our *Honour*, not our *Shame*) I answer, that none of us suffered for opposing, writing, or speaking against the Bishops legall authority, or any ceremonies established in our Church by Act of Parliament; but onely against their pretended divine right to their Episcopall Lordly power, diametrically contrary to *Scripture, Fathers, Councils, the best Protestant and Popish Authors, the Statutes of our Realm*; and against their *Innovations in doctrine, discipline, ceremonies, canons, &c.* contrary to the Lawes of the land, Articles, and Homilies of our Church (as the Parliament hath resolved them) as all our Books demonstrate, and Dr *Bastwicke* in direct termes, in the Preface of his *Flagellum*; And therefore it could be neither pride, arrogance, nor schisme, but meer conscience and duty in us, to oppose them in these their *usurpations and innovations* only, contrary to the *Laws of God and the Realme*: If he and his would containe themselves within these our bounds, our Church should enjoy more peace, their persons more honour, then now they are likely to gaine, by opposing, prejudicating both the *Parliaments and Synods proceedings*, though never so pious, conscientious, religious.

3. His pretended contradiction of the third *Quere* to the first, is formerly answered; I shall onely adde, that things may be consonant to the * *generall Rules* of Gods Word, though not precisely prescribed in it: All *Independent Ladies Gentlemen*, (and you I hope) will grant, that their different fashions, ha-

* 37 H. 8. c.
17. 1 E. 6. c. 1.
1 Eliz. c. 1.
See my Brevi-ate against Bishops Encroachments, &c. The Vnbi-shopping of Timothy and Titus. The Catalogue of authors in all ages concerning the parity and identity of Bishops and Presbyters. The antipathy of the English Lordly prelacy. The Quench-coale, &c.

* Phil. 4. 8.
1 Ths. 5. 22.
bits, 22

bits, colours, attires, are all agreeable to Gods Word, (if modest) and warranted by this generall precept 1 Tim. 2.9. *Let women adorn themselves in modest apparel,* though not particularized in the Text: So may a church-government or *Dresse* be consonant to Scripture, though not precisely delineated or enjoined by it.

4. To the fourth he gives no answer at all, but bids me prove it; which I have done already in my *Independency examined*, till it be disproved.

5. To the fifth, he grants that *Independency will overthrow all Nationall Churches and Synods*; and the two *Independent Brethren* assure us in their Reply to A.S.p. 211 that in time it cannot but overthrow all other sorts of Ecclesiasticall governments: Is it not then a turbulent, dangerous, schismaticall, unquiet (that I say not insufferable) Government, by your owne confessions, which will admit no equall nor corivall; nor yet any Nationall Church, Synod, Parliament, Prince, or temporall Magistrate, to exercise any Ecclesiasticall, Legislative, or Magisteriall authority over any of their *Conventicles*, members, persons, liberties, estates, much lesse over their consciences, as they are Christians? Will any Parliament, State, or Nation, (think you) suffer such a Government to take root among them, which will un-King, un-Parliament, un-church, un-Nation them altogether, and make each severall congregation an absolute Monarchy, Church, Republick, Nation, within it selfe, depending on, subordinate wholly to it selfe, as if it and they were no part or members of the publike? The Lord preserve us from such a dividing and overturning Government. As for his invectives against the *Formality, Tyranny, and enslaving of mens judgments in the Presbyterian way, as inconsistent with spirituall liberty and State priviledges*; they are meere groundlesse calumnies, to draw an odium on it, (some of your male-contented party professing they would rather set up Lordly Episcopacy, which they have abjured, then it) whereas these aspersions suit better with your independent modell, which is more rigid, uncharitable, unfociable, Papall, tyrannicall, Anti-monarchicall, Anti-synodicall, yea Anti-parliamentall, (as I have elsewhere manifested) then any other church-government whatsoever. For my pretended *bitter expressions*, they are so suitable to the effects and reall consequences of this *New way*, (as you stile it) that I could not expresse my self in other language, without injury to the truth: and if any of my *best Friends, who stood by me in my sufferings, deem themselves injured or reproached by them*, (as you pretend, though none of them have yet complained to me) it is (I hope) onely *scandalum acceptum, non datum*; and I presume my Friends are so ingenuous, as not to be offended with me for *reproving only their errors with ingenuous freedom, in which I manifest my self their *greatest Friend*, because I neither spare nor flatter them in their mistakes: However, though I really honour all my Christian Friends, as well Independent as Presbyterian (whom you most scandalously traduce as Episcopall and time-servers heretofore) yet I preferre the *truth of God, the peace and safety of my Native, bleeding, dying Church and Countrey, (now much endangered by our unhappy divisions) before all Friends or earthly comforts whatsoever. As for your pretended unsubjectiō of Presbyterian Synods and Churches to the Parliament in settling Ecclesiasticall matters, I neither know nor plead for any such; and our present Assembly being both appointed, directed by, and submitting all their determinations wholly to the Parliament, (as they are obliged both by Orders, Protestation, Covenant, and professe they ought to doe) armes me sufficiently against any such improbable untrue surmise.

* Lev. 19. 17
Gal. 4. 16. c. 3.
11. 14. Tit. 1.
13. 14. Rev. 3.
13. will justify
sime herein.

* Pro. 23. 23.
Maximè amica
veritas.

6. To the sixth *Quere* he returns no answer, but plainly yeelds, *that there was never any Independent Church in any age or Nation whatsoever, totally converted to the christian faith, till this present; nor any one Author that maintained it, till Mr Ainsworth (a Separatist) from whom the Apologists professe their dissent in some things. As for any reverend godly persons, who now contend for this new Modell (whole piety, eminency make their errors not lesse false, but farre more dangerous, & infectious) though I reverence their persons, yea judgments too in other things, yet I cannot subscribe to them in this new dangerous Hypoth, which is not yet so beaten as to deserve the name of Christs Road-way. For the new supposed light, discovered in these dayes, touching church-government, if you meane it onely of your Independency, (which you borrowed from the Brownists, or Low-country Anabaptists, the first inventors of this Government) I doubt when brought out to the light, and examined by the word of light, it will for the most part prove but twilight, if not darknesse. If you meane it of any other light, that is truly such, we blesse God for it, and desire to walke brotherly and unanimously in it.*

* If therefore the light that is in you be Darknesse, how great is that Darknesse? Mat. 6. 23.

In the seventh he grants, *that the Law of Nature, which instructs men to unite themselves into one Nationall State, or civill Government, doth likewise teach them to joine themselves into, subject themselves unto one Nationall Church, and to Nationall Synods, Parliaments, in point of church-government; in which every particular man hath his Vote though not in proper person (which hee objects is necessarie, but I deny, since all cannot possibly assemble) yet in their deputies, Knights, Burgesses, or selected Commissioners: and though it bee true, that Christ hath not given Magistrates such absolute authority over mens consciences as bodies, (as you object) yet hee hath enjoined us to bee subject to the higher powers, and to every lawfull ordinance of man (not repugnant to his Word) EVEN FOR CONSCIENCE SAKE, and THE LORDS SAKE too. For my passage, That there is no example of gathering independent Congregations, not of Infidels but of men already converted to, and sealed in the Christian Faith, unlesse derived from the private conventicles of Arians, Novatians, Donatists, and other Hereticks, w^{ch} yet w^{re} not independent among themselves; it is not a bitter speech, (as you phrase it) but a true one and onely bitter to you because undeniable: For as it was the common practice of those seducing Hereticks, Sectaries to gather private Conventicles of their own, and labour to draw other orthodox Christians from their proper Ministers, to incorporate themselves into their private separated congregations, as Historians informe us: So no such practice of alluring and stealing away other Pastors sheep from their proper Shepherd who first converted them to, and edified them in the faith and grace of Christ can be produced, but only in these Hereticks and Sectaries whose practice your Independents imitate. As for those private conventicles (as he perverteth them) for which he saith I may blesse God, that I was remembered in them with tears, when others durst not name me; as I do really blesse God for them and those who remembered me effectually in them, so I dare not stile them Conventicles in an ill sense, since not [†] such by Law, being only lawfull Assemblies of private Christians to seek unto God by prayer & fasting upon extraordinary occasions, which all good Christians cannot but approve: But all these meetings were farre from being then stiled, reputed Independent Churches, or having any affinity with them; so as they make nothing for his cause.*

* Rom. 13. 5.
1 Pet. 2. 14.

* Justinian Codicis. l. 1. tit. 8.
Socrates scholast. Eccl. hist. l. 7. c. 5. l. 5. c. 4, 5, 15, 20, 21
23. l. 4. c. 12.
13. l. 2. c. 33.
* Sec 35. Eliz. c. 1.
† Sec 35. Eliz. c. 1. None are Conventicles but Hereticks or Schismatickes, who wholly separate themselves from our publique Assemblies established by Law.
Justin Codicis l. 1. Tit. 8.

8. To the eighth *Quere* he gives a negative Answer, First in generall next in particular to some instances. First he grants, *that there was a Nationall Church* (yea Nationall assemblies, Parliaments, determining church-affaires) *of the Jewes, but these (saith he) cannot be a pattern for us now, because the covenant of the Gospell is not made with any one particular Nation, as with the Jewes, but to all Nations that embrace the Gospell, and beleve in Christ; you have no promise nor prophesie of any Nation to be holy to God but the Jewes Nation, when they shall bee called againe.*

To which I reply, first, That Independents have not the least precept or example for any solemne Covenant made betwixt God and men, *to walke in the wayes of God, &c.* but onely * in the old Testament, and Church of the Israelites, and that no private congregationall, but publicke Nationall covenant, prescribed by the supreme temporall Magistrate and Assembly, not by the Priestis or private Synagogues; yea the principall precepts, presidents for publicke or private fasts, sanctifying the Sabbath, &c. you likewise derive from the old Testament and that Church; why then should not their Nationall Church be a pattern for us, and you to imitate, as well as their Nationall covenant, fasting, sabbath-keeping; the Church of God being all one, (as it is a Church) both under the old Testament and new; and the pattern of it under the Law a better president for the Church under the Gospell, (of which it was a type and fore-runner) then the pattern of the Tabernacle shewed in the Mount (so frequent in your Lips and Books) a president for your Independent Modell, to which it hath no analogy. 2. This reason is most absurd and false, the Covenant of the Gospell extending not onely to particular persons, but to all Nations and people whatsoever, who are both prophesied and promised to become Christs own inheritance, possession, people, spouse, church, and to be an **HOLY NATION, A PECVLIAIR PEOPLE &c. to the Lord**, in infinite Texts both of the old and new Testament, which I wonder the Respondent should either not see, or forget, being ten thousand fold more cleare and visible then his Independent platforme, which few or none can yet espy in Scripture, History, or Politiques.

2. He addes, *that I cannot shew any Nation, every member whereof is qualified sufficiently to make up a church, which is Christs body, unlesse I will take in Drunkards, Whore-masters &c. to be members of a church, whereas the Word saith, they must be visible Saints, and this cannot be avoided in a Nationall church.*

I answer, that I dare not be wiser then my Master Christ, who informes me, *that there will, and must be alwayes in the visible church on earth (be it Nationall, parochiall, presbyteriall, or congregationall) * goats among the sheep, chaffe among the wheat (which must grow together till the harvest, at the end of the world, to wit the day of judgment) &c. good fish mixed with the bad in the churches* Net. 2. I finde a [a] Judas, a Devill, among the Apostles, many [b] grosse sinners, idolaters, and corruptions in the Jewish church; many abuses, Epicures, Drunkards, Whore-masters, Libertines, uncleane persons, and false Teachers, in the churches of Galatia, Ephesus, Colosse, Pergamum, Smyrna, Thyatira, and Laodicea; yet the Scripture expressly stiles them [c] the body and churches of Christ, and repures such members (though corrupt ones) of those Churches; who doe not actually cease to be members, when excommunicated or suspended for a season, after they are baptized, and professe the Christian faith: nor did any separate from these churches, though they had some corruptions and evil members. For you therefore to separate from

* 2 Chro. 15.
8, to 16. c. 34.
27, to 33. 8. 29
10. Ezra 10. 3.
Neh. 9. 38. c.
10. 1. &c.
† Psal. 2. 8.
9. Psal. 72. 8.
13. 18. Psal. 8. 2.
14. 86. 9. Psal. 65
2. Psal. 67. 2. 3.
4. 5. Isa. 2. 3.
1. 9. 12. 23. c.
11. 9. to 16.
6. 5. 4. 1. 2. 3. c.
60. 3. to 22.
Mich. 4. 1. to 5.
Mal. 1. 11.
Zach. 8. 22.
A. 13. 46. 47
48. Matth. 28.
19. 20. Mar.
14. 15. Rom.
10. 18. 20 c.
11. 4. Isa. 62.
to the end.
1 Pet. 2. 9. 10.
* Matth. 3. 12
c. 13. 24. to 52
c. 25. 32. 35.
a. Joh. 6. 70. 71
b See Judges,
Samuel, Kings
Chronicles,
Nehemiah,
Ezra, and all
the Prophets.
c See Pauls.
and Johns, yea
Christs Epi-
stles to them.
Rev. 2. & 3.
1. Co. 11. 13
10. 34. c. 12.
13. 27.

from, and unchurch such Nationall or Parochial churches, which have some such members in them, is to unchurch all churches both in the old, the new Testament, and world it self, yea your own churches too. 3. The Scripture is expresse, [d] *that many are called, but few chosen and saved; that all must be compelled to come into the church, though they want the wedding-garment*: There never was, nor shall be here on earth, any one visible church compacted wholly of reall elected Saints, without any mixture of Reprobates; such a church we shall meet with onely in heaven, I am sure you can gather none such on earth. 4. Are there no corrupt or drunken members in your independent churches, but onely reall visible Saints? are there no usurers, oppressors, corrupt dealers, covetous, proud, malicious, uncharitable, censorious persons; no apparent hypocrites or dissemblers? yea, are there not many sinnes and corruptions in the best, the choicest of all your members; (who cannot depart away, or quite separate themselves from their * own bosome corruptions,) as there is and will be in the best of men during their mortality? If your Independent congregations consist of such members as these, of men subject to like passions, sinnes, infirmities as others in Presbyteriall churches, what then is become of this your reason and principall ground of *Independency*, or rather, *Separation*, or *Brownism*, its ancient proper title? you may lay it up in Lavender for another world, but can make no use of it in this, where you cannot so much as dream of a church of reall Saints, without any mixture of corruption: And therefore rather then separate, or leave us in a *Pelt*; because you cannot have your wills in all things, you should with blessed *Paul* (as tender-conscienced no doubt as any of you, and a lawfull pattern for your imitation, * *to the Jew become as Jewes that you might gaine the Jewes, to them that are under the Law, as under the Law, that you might gaine them that are under the Law: to them that are without Law, as being not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ; that you might gaine them who are without Law. To the weak you should become as weak, that you might gaine the weak: yea be made all things to all men, that you might by all meanes gaine some.* Which how farre you in your new way are from, let all men Judge.

3. For his answers to that of *Acts 15.* all ages, churches, till this present, have held it both an expresse warrant and president for the lawfulness, usefulness of Nationall and Provinciaall Synods to determine differences in Religion, (which particular churches, persons cannot decide) and making necessary Canons for church-affaires; neither can all his shifts elude it: To his first and second reasons, or rather evasions I answer, it is clear by *Acts 15. 2.* that the church of *Antioch* it selfe could not decide the question, nor *Paul* nor *Barnabas* satisfactorily determine it, so farre as to quiet all parties; and therefore they sent *Delegates to the Apostles and Elders at Hierusalem, there to decide it*: None is so ignorant but knowes, that there are many controversies now on foot concerning doctrine, discipline, and church-government, which no particular congregations, (nay hardly an whole Synod and Parliament together) are sufficient to settle and determine; therefore there is a kinde of necessity of Nationall Synods as well as of Parliaments, whence all ages, churches, have used them. To his third reason I reply, that it is evident by expresse words *vers. 2. 5. 6. 7. 10. 19. 20. 24.* that the principall end why the Apostles went up to Hierusalem, and why this Synod assembled, was not to prove the false Apostles liars, (as he affirmeth) but to debate and consider *THIS QUESTION AND MATTER*, whether the

d Mat. 24. 14.
15. c. 26. 16.
Luk. 14. 23,
&c. c. 13. 27,
24.

* Rom. 7. 15.
to 25. Jam. 3.
2. A&C. 14. 15

* 1 Cor. 9. 19
24

Gentiles ought to be circumcised? To his fourth, I say, that though this meeting was occasional, yet it is a sufficient warrant for generall meetings, which are usually called, only upon speciall occasions of moment: In it there was a generall assembling of all the *Apostles, Elders, and Brethren at Hierusalem*, (where there were then divers particular congregations, as our Assembly long since resolved from *Acts 2.6.41. 42.46. 47. c.4.4. c.5.14.15. 16.42. c.6.1. to 9. c.8.2,3,4. c.11.1,2. c.12.12,13. c.21. 17, 18.23, 22.* which if Independents deny, then they must prove, that all the Apostles and Elders at Hierusalem were Pastors but of one and the self-same individuall congregation; and then what becomes of their Independent churches; which have no Apostle, and onely one Pastor, but scarce any Elders in them) who upon this speciall and some other publike occasions met all together, and that not to advise onely, but determine and resolve, as is evident by *vers. 6. to 32. c.16.4. c.21.25.* which compared with the Texts of the old Testament in the Margin of my *Quere*, where we finde frequent Nationall generall Assemblies, Synods, or Parliaments (if I may so stile them) among the Israelites (prescribed, appointed by God, and no wayes contradicted, revoked under the Gospel) determining all Ecclesiastical controversies, settling, ordering all church-affaires, matters concerning the Arke, Temple, Sacrifices, Paschever, Priests, Nationall covenants, Fasting-dayes, Festivalls, suppressions of Idolatry, false Worship, Reliques of Idolatry, and the like; are an impregnable evidence of the lawfulnessse of Nationall Synods, Parliaments, Assemblies, in all Christian Kingdomes, Republics, upon the like occasions, and that they are endued with equivalent authority; there being no one Text in the old or new Testament, nor any shadow of reason, (but meer shifts or obstinacy of spirit against publike government, order, and authority) to controll it. If any pretend they doe it onely out of conscience, if they will but seriously gage their owne deceitfull hearts, I feare their conscience will prove but wilfulnessse, having neither precept president, nor right reason to direct it: So as I may truly retort his own calumny against me on him and his, that his and their own name, will, or opinion, is their onely argument against this shining truth, which all ages, Churches, have acknowledged, ratified, practised; without the least dispute.

9.

To my ninth *Quere*, and arguments in it, he returnes nothing worthy Reply, but upon this *Petitio principii*, or begging of the thing disputed; that the Scripture and Apostles have prescribed a set forme of Government in all after ages for the Churches of Christ, which he neither can, nor endeavours to prove; and that Churches in the Apostles dayes were Independent, though doubtlesse all Churches were then subject to the Apostles Lawes, Orders, Edicts, Decisions, though no immediate Ministers or Pastors of them, (as appeares by their Epistles to them) therefore not Independent: so as my arguments hold firme, and his answers weak. As for his retorted argument, That the Scriptures were writ in the infancy of the Church: Therefore wiser and better Scriptures may be writ now; it is a blasphemous and absurd conclusion. they being all writ by the spirit and inspiration of God himselfe the very *Ascient of dayes*, who hath neither infancy nor imperfection, as the Church hath. To his second objection that I would needs make a Nationall Church, Stare, more perfect, understanding, and wise, then a congregational: I fcare not to averre it: since warranted by direct Scripture and since your selves must grant, that the Church under the Law was more perfect then that before it; the Church under the Gospell more perfect then under the Law;

and

† 1 Chro. 13.
1.50. 14.c.28,
& 29. 2 Chro.
5.2, &c. c.6, &
7. c.15. 9, to 29
c.17.7, 8, &c.
c.20.3, 4, 5.
c.24.4, to 16.
c.29.3, to 36.
c.30. v. 31. c.
34.29, to the
end. c.35. 1, &
19. Ezra &
Neh. through-
out. Esh. 9.
17. to 32.

* Ps. 7-9. 13.
* Ephes. 4. 11.
32. 13. 2 Cor
13. 9. Heb. 6.
1. * Pet. 5. 10.
Phil. 3. 12. 15
Heb. 13. 21.
James 1. 4.

and the Churches under the Gospel, at the end of the Apostles dayes, when furnished with more *divine knowledge, Scriptures, Gospels, Officers, and rules of Faith, Manners, Discipline, more compleat and perfect then at their beginning to pre. ch.* No man doubts, that though a *new-born infant and Christian have all the parts and members of a man and Saint*, yet they have not so much perfection, *understanding, knowledge, judgment, strength of grace, or spirituall wisdom, as grown men and Christians.* An aged, experienced, growne Minister, Christian, is more compleat and perfect then a new converted *† Novice, or Babe in grace; Ergo* a growne and Nationall Church, then crie but in the Embryo. Your Independent Churches, in their primitive infancy, when they had but two or three members onely in them, and wanted both Elders, Deacons, and other necessary church-officers (as Mr *Synpsons* church first did) I am certain in your own opinion were not so complete and mature as you intended to make them afterwards by degrees: a Village is not so compleate a Republike or Corporation as a City, nor a City as a *† Kingdom*, nor a Family as a County, nor a Consistory as a Synod, nor a court of Aldermen as a common-cour cell, nor that as a Parliament: Therefore an Independent singular congregation not so complete as a Nationall church, being oft enforced to pray in the aid of other churches for advice, assistance &c. (as your selves confesse) which an whole Nationall Church need not to doe. In fine *himselfe confesseth, that the Apostles made new rules for government and discipline as occasion served; and that as God fitted occasions, so he made knowne new rules successively by degrees, not at once; and added new Officers, as Evangelicall Bshps, Elders, Deacons, Widowes, Evangelists, Doctors, Pastors, Teachers (which some distinguish from Presbyters, and define to be severall officers.)* Therefore the infant Church in the Apostles dayes was not so compleat, perfect in all parts as the multiplied and growne churches afterwards.

My tenth *Quere* he wilfully misseith, as he doth the rest, else he had not the least shadow of exception against it, as I propounded it, and then returns an answer by way of dilemma to it: To which I reply, *That if the Parliament and Synod shall by publike consent establish a Presbyteriall church-government, as most consonant to Gods Word, the Lawes and Reiglement of this Kingdome, Independents and all others are bound in conscience to submit unto it, under paine of obstinacy, singularity, &c. in case they cannot really prove it diametrically contrary to the Scriptures, and simply unlawfull in point of conscience, not by fancies, or remote inconsequences, but by direct Texts and precepts (which they can never doe;) and that because it is thus commanded, established by the higher powers, to which in all lawfull or indifferent things wee are bound to render all due and full obedience, without resistance, even for conscience sake, by expresse Gospel Texts, Rom. 13. 1, to 7. Tit. 3. 1. 1 Pet. 2. 14, 15. which I wish you would practise better, and make make more conscience of then now you doe.* As for his crosse Interrogatories I answer, 1. That if the Popes Councils command lawfull things to those who are subject to their power, they are as well to be obeyed as the commands of *† heathen Emperours, Magistrates, Parents, Husbands, by Christian Subjects, Wives, Servants, living under them, are.* 2. That there is a great difference between matters of opinion onely, and of practise; That his instanced points, *whether Lord's Episcopacy be jure divino; or their making out Processe under their owne Names and Seales be agreeable to the Law of the Land,* are matters onely of opinion simply in themselves; and if a Synod and Parliament should have determined the

* 1 Cor. 13.
11, 12. c. 14.
20. c. 3. 1.
1 Pet. 2. 2.
Heb. 5. 12, 13,
14. 1 Ioh. 2.
11. 10 15.
Ephes. 4. 15. 16
† 1 Tim. 3. 6.

† Ezek. 16. 13.

10

* Rom. 13. 1,
to 7. 1 Tim 2
1, 2, 3. Tit 3. 1
1 Pet. 2. 1, 2, to
24 c. 3. 1.
1 Cor. 7. 1, to
19. Eph. 5. 2, 3
23. c. 6. 1. to
10. Col. 3. 18,
to 25.

first, and the Judges resolved the last, affirmatively, their resolutions could not binde my judgement absolutely, so farre as to subscribe their opinions as undoubted truths, unlesse they could satisfie my arguments and authorities to the contrary; but yet they should & ought to bind me for the present so far as to submit to their authority & Proesse in their own names in things within their legall cognifance: So if the Parliament and Assembly shall establish any Church-government, as most agreeable to the Scriptures and our Lawes, though this binds not all Independents to be simply of their opinion, unlesse the reasons and arguments produced for it be sufficient to convince their judgments, yet it binds them in point of practise and obedience, outwardly to submit thereto, and not to separate from it, under pain of *arrogancy, faction, schisme*, unlesse they can clearly manifest it to be absolutely unlawfull and repugnant to the Scripture. As for my own objected challenge to the Bishops & Judges about the *ius divinum* of Lordly Prelacy, and Bishops Proesse in their own names; when I made it, I was certain I had both † Scripture, Fathers, Councils, Acts of Parliament, the suffrages of all forraigne Reformed Churches, Writers, and our owne learnedest Bishops, Authors in all times against the first; and direct Acts, Resolutions of Parliament, Patents, unanswerable Law-authorities, and Reasons against the latter: Therefore a few Lordly Prelates, opinions in their owne case, or the subitane, forced, extrajudiciall resolution of the Judges (not then published) could no more conclude my judgment, nor make me guilty of arrogancy, obstinacy, or schism then, than their forced judgments for the lawfulnessse of Loanes and Ship-money, against expresse Acts and judgments of Parliament, oblige me or others, then or now, not to deeme that tax illegall: and when you can produce as many good authorities, Reasons from Scripture, Antiquity, Acts of Parliament, Writers of all sorts, against the lawfulnessse of Presbytery, as I have done against Lordly Episcopacy by divine right. Bishops making out Proesse under their own Names, Seals, and Ship-mony, neither of which were ever settled by any former Parliament, and have all bin expressely voted against in this; I shall then excuse you from arrogancy and schisme, but till this be done, (as I presume it will never be) the guilt of both these wil stick fast upon you, if you readily conforme not in outward practise to that Government the Parliament shall establish. If they should settle Independency, I am certaine you would then write and preach for universall obedience to it, (which you now publicly call for so eagerly without authority or proof of its Divinity) because thus settled, without dispute: therefore by like reason you ought to submit to a Presbytery, or such other Government as shall be resolved on by those intrusted with this care; notwithstanding any thing you have said, or this New Independent sencelesse argument of * Mr J. C. which some of your partie much rely on: *The Saints shall judge the world (as the day of Judgment)* 1 Cor. 6. 2. Ergo, the Parliament (chosen by the suffrage of the World) and the Synod, may not make any Lawes in matters of Discipline, Worship, or Government, to regulate or oblige Saints now: They might better have concluded, Ergo the Parliament, or any secular Magistrate, cannot judge them now for any secular matter; since the Apostle useth this expression onely to blame them for going to Law before Heathen (not Christian) Judges, for secular matters, *vers. 1. 6, 7.* Such Independent arguments will but ill support your Independent fabrick.

To my II. *Quere* he gives only a negative answer, and then declaims against Presby-

† See my Catalogue, &c. The unbishopping of Timothy and Titus. A Breviate and Antipathy of the English Lordly Prelacy.

† See my humble Remonstrance against Ship-money.

* In his Sermon on Feb. 25

Presbytery without ground or reason : But because I have proved the truth of what he denies in my *Independency examined*, and in some following pages, I shal not trouble you with any further proof, except these two particulars: 1. That *Independency* is in reality meer *Separation* and *Brownism*, lately christened with this new title, to take off its odium; and if so, I doubt not but it is a nursery of schisms, Sectaries, &c. 2. That we finde by wofull experience, what bloody divisions, warres, schisms, the toleration but of one Religion and Sect in our Realms contrary to that established, (to wit Popery and Papists) hath produced in all our Dominions, to their imminent danger, and almost utter ruine; what then will the free permission of many Independent different forms of Churches, Sectaries do? will it not produce many more troubles, dangers, wars, schisms, then we have hitherto felt? Yea, if every man ought to have freedom of conscience, to vent what opinions, & set up what Governments he deems most conformable to the Word in his own private fancie, you must indulge Papists this liberty as well as others: and then how soone will they over-run us for the future; how justly can we take up armes to suppress them for the present? Consider seriously of these and other publike mischiefs of your way, and that liberty of conscience you so much contest for, (which in truth is nothing but meere lawlesnesse, or licentiousnesse, to do ** what seemes good in your owne eyes, as if there was no King in Israel*, without respect to the publike peace, weale, or glory of God) and then happily you may in time discern, recant your error.

* Deut. 12. 8.
Judges 17.
6. r. 21. 25.

To my twelfth *Quere* he onely answers, that I fall a *jeering* of my brethren, (a palpable untruth) and that I put a *nick-name* on them, to make them odious; to wit, the title of Independents, which they disclaime; not answering one syllable to the substance of the Question. To which I reply: First, that the title of *Independency* (of which you are now ashamed) was at first assumed, approved by your selves, and many of your party doe still owne, though some disclaime it, of purpose to evade the titles of *Separatists* and *Brownists*, with whom you really concur in practice: Besides, you very well know that this title was imposed on, and owned by you long before I writ; therefore I could not father this brat upon you: But if you be offended with this name, I desire you in your next Pamphlet to discover to us your owne Christian name, with the true title of your party, and the government you plead for as the only way of Christs institution, (all which you have hitherto concealed) and then (God willing) I shall give you a further answer to this cavill, or retract this title; till then I must informe you, that it most proper for your party, who will have every one of your owne private congregations, a complete absolute corporation, exempted from, unsubjected to, independent on any other, be it a Nationall, Synodall, Provinciall, Parochiall assembly, Parliament or Kings themselves in any Church-affaires: You must therefore still retaine this Title, whiles you maintaine such Paradoxes both in opinion, practice, (and that by meere *Independent inferences*) as justly appropriated to you; *Convenient rebus nomina sepe suis*, being never more exactly verified then in this your suitable name.

But you object, first, *That you are accountable for your actions to every neighbour Church, that shall in the name of Christ require it.* Secondly, *That you stand not independent from, but hold communion with all other Churches, both in the Ordinances, and in asking counsell and advice mutually.*

To the first I answer, 1. That if you are accountable for your actions to every particular

particular neighbour Church, then why not much more to a Synod or Parliament, whose ecclesiasticall jurisdiction over you or your Churches is denied by you? Secondly, if you are thus accountable to every neighbour Church, doe you intend it of Parochiall, Episcopall, or Presbyteriall Churches, as well as Independent; or of Independent onely? If of Independent onely, as I suppose you doe, then you appeale onely to Churches of your owne partie, frame, judgment, and make one of them subordinate, accountable to another, but not to any other Church; which is an apparent schisme, separation from all other Churches, and contradicts your second objection: If of all other sorts of Churches as well as Independent, you must either grant them true Churches of Christ, and then you have no ground to sever from them; or if false, or no true Churches of Christ, (as you in truth repute them) then by your own principles they are no competent Judges of Ecclesiasticall affaires, nor you accountable to them. Thirdly, How (I pray) doe you hold your selves accountable to every neighbour Church? by way of subordination, correction or just appeal? that I am certain you will deny: or only by way of voluntary information and satisfaction, when required, which I conceive you mean? If so only, then this is properly no account at all, or but arbitrary at most, which you may deny if you please; and if you erre, or prove faulty, or refractory, this neighbour Church can but admonish, not enforce you to correct your errors or injustice: and so this will prove but a meere mockery in stead of an account.

To the second I answer, *That if you stand not Independent from other Churches, but hold communion with them in Ordinances, and in mutuall counsell and advice, Then 1. why doe you separate from them as no true Churches, and oppose their way of Government with so much bitterness? Secondly, why doe you refuse to administer Baptisme and the Lords Supper to those who are their members, in your Churches, unless they be professed members of some Independent Congregation? Thirdly, why do you not follow their advice counsell; or the Parliaments Synods admonition, and submit thereto; who now earnestly perswade you from your way of separation, division, in these distracted times? the end of demanding good counsell and advice being but to follow, not reject it, where there is humility, ingenuity, or sincerity in those who ask it. You must therefore either disclaime these objected concessions, or become more tractable for the future. 4. You tell us in the next succeeding lines, *That neither I, nor Synods, nor this Synod, are infallible, but as subject to errors as others; and that never more dangerous errors have been confirmed then by Synods: and therefore men are not bound in conscience to their decrees upon penalty of sinne, wrongancy, &c.* But pray Sir may not you and your Independent Ministers, Churches erre as well as others? Is infallibility annexed onely to your private Chaires, conventicles? If not, then why may not your new-minted *Way* be a meere errorious *By-path*, and no way of Christ as well as other waies, and you erre herein as well as Synods in other things? Why will you have the major vote in your congregationall decisions to over-rule and bind the rest to obedience, (as your practice and opinions intimate) since the major part may possibly be mistaken, as well as the lesse dissenting? Shall nothing binde in any Churches, but what is unanimously voted *nemine contradicente*? or shall one or two dissenting voices over-rule the rest, or not be bound by the most? or where all consent, may not all yet be in an error, and not discern it, through selfe-love to their*

† Yea, never more dangerous errors refuted, suppressed, then in the 4. first general Councils, and some Synods since, as that of Dort, and other Protestant Synods Seeke: Harmony of Confession: Where therefore they determine rightly, you must submit unto them; where they confirm apparent dangerous errors, there you may vary from them when Proved such.

owne wayes and opinions, till others of contrary judgements discover and convince them of their error? Away then with this fond argument and evasion; Synods and Parliaments may erre in some things, *Ergo* they must binde us in no thing: Is this good Logicke or Divinity? Good Ministers may and doe erre sometimes in some points of Divinitie, *Ergo* wee will beleever them in none, no not in those things in which they doe not erre. Will you throw away all the Apple because one part of it only is rotten? or reject Communion with the best of men because they have some infirmities? Deal then with the Ecclesiasticall decrees of Synods and Parliaments as in wisdom, in conscience you are bound to doe: Where they are just, equal, not opposite to the word, embrace, submit unto them; when erroneous or contrariant to the expresse word (not to your own fancies, inferences or opinions) you may differ from them in judgment, but you must patiently suffer under them in point of practise & obedience (if meelyr practical) till a further season, and not disturb the Churches peace by opposition or schism: which is as good, as seasonable Christian advice, as that you conclude with unto me, which I heartily with your selfe had first followed, who have more defamed the ways of Christ and used more personall unchristian bitterness then I am guilty of. You wish indeed, *O that a spirit of love were maintained among those that are brethren: though they differ in judgment, must they needs differ in affection?* I lay the same. But O then why seporate you from us, yea passe uncharitable censures on us as if we were not your Brethren? One Kingdom, one City, House, doth now, on the heaven shall hereafter contain us both: why not then one church government, one Church Militant, as well as one Triumphant? If you deem *not your selves more holy* then your brethren, or be not swelled up with spiritual pride (as your stiling your selves *M: n of rich anoynting from God, the most religiously affected, and best conserned people of the land, the most precious men, &c.* with your separation from us, and harsh censures of us, make most men suspect) then why refuse you to close with us now, as you have done heretofore? Could our Ministers, Churches, when more corrupt, convert, regenerate, edifie, save you, and yet not now so much as hold you, when more reined and reformed? If yea, then let us both shake hands without any more encounters; if nay, then fairely chalke out your yet concealed independent way and platforme in all its severall lineaments, and beautifull native colours; produce your severall punctuall Scriptures, Arguments, to maintain it, (there being none of them extant in these your *Observations* for ought I can find) that so I may see the frame and grounds of this new Fabricke, in as large or narrow a Modell as you please: and then doubt not but an Answer shall be given to what ever you modestly set forth, (if worthy answer) in case it be not satisfactorie, or else a friendly embrace thereof, if agreeable to the Spirit and Word of truth, by him who hath learned *Pauls* petemprorie resolution, 2 Cor. 13. 8. *We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth*; in which resolution (God assisting) I resolve to live and die.

* These are the true grounds of all separations. Esa 65. 5. Luk. 18. 10, to 16. Iude 18. 19. witnesseth the *Novatians, Donatists*, of old: The severall orders of Monks, Nuns, Eremites, Anchors, in the Church of Rome, and their new order of Jesuits, each of them pretending more sanctity and strictness then another, and so severing in their different orders, habits, Monasteries, rules, covenants, one from another. † A Goodwins Theomachia p. 24, 25. The Reply of two of the Brethren passion.

Certaine briefe Animadversions on Mr John Goodwins Theomachia, in illustration of some passages in *Mr Independency Examined, Unmasked &c.* and of the Parliaments Ecclesiasticall power.

IT is not my intencion to repeat or refute all the unseasonable offensive passages in the *Epistle or Body* of this *Treatise*, which tacitly

ly reflect upon the present Religious Parliament and Assembly, raising need-
 less feares and jealousies of them both (in matters of RELIGION and
 Church-Government) as if they really intended * to increase our misery and
 bondage, by rejecting and oppressing truth; * to conjure all mens gifts, parts indu-
 stry into a Synodical Circle; and that there is almost as little hope of gathering
 P 8. 11. 33. 44. grapes from thornes, or figges of Thistles, as of having the joy of our faith holpen, or
 to 52. increased, or any decrease, but rather increase of evils by them; the resolutions of
 Councils, and Synods themselves upon the matter and just account, being but the
 fruits, or puttings forth of the learning and judgment of a very few men, not alwayes
 of the most consciencious &c. I shall only select some few particulars worthy con-
 sideration; to fill up my vacant Pages.

6 Page 18. 22.
 52. and else-

Gamaliell
 Himselfe no
 Apostle, nor
 Christian,
 from whose
 words you yet
 take your text
 s. Gospell,
 was not alto-
 gether of this
 opinion.

1.

* See Epi-
 phani-
 mus, Basil,
 Augustine, and
 all the Bookes
 of or against
 any Hereticks,
 and Secta-
 ries.

* Marth. 4. 6.

* Mat. 24. 11.

23. 10. 7. c. 7.

15. 2 Cor. 11

13. 14. 15.

1. Thes. 4. 14.

2. Thes. 2. 9. 10

Rev. 13. 2. to

28. 2. Ioh. 10.

20.

First, it may be justly questioned, whether the maine doctrine prosecuted in it
 (b) ' That it is the greatest imprudence under Heaven, for any man or ranke of
 ' men whatsoever to appeare, or so much as to lift up an hand, or thought, against
 ' any way, doctrine or practise whatsoever clayming origination or descent from
 ' God, till we have securitie upon securitie, evidence upon evidence, yea all the
 ' securitie that men in an ordinary way are capable of, and foundations as cleare
 ' as the noone day, that such wayes, Doctrines and practises, only pretend unto
 ' God as the Author of them, and that in truth they are not at all from him, but
 ' either from men, or from baser Parentage; that they are but counterfeits and
 ' pretenders only, and stand in no relation at all, but that of enmitie and oppositi-
 ' on unto God; and that we are not to act the value of one haire of our head a-
 ' gainst them, untill we see their condemnation written with a beame of the
 ' Sunne, by the finger of God Himselfe; untill he hath disclaimed or renounced
 ' it from Heaven, either by giving such wisdom unto men, whereby to detest
 ' the vanitie of it, or else hath quite rased it out of the flesh and Tables of the
 ' hearts of his servants, &c. Be Ortodox or tolerable? For these ensuing reasons.

1. First, because it opens a wide gate to the reviving of all old, the spreading and
 propagating of all new Heresies, Errors, Schismes, Sects and opinions whatsoever,
 without the least timely opposition or prevention, to the endangering of infi-
 nite soules, and disturbance of the Churches, Kingdoms peace. For there is * no
 Hereticke, Schismaticke, or Sectary whatsoever, (though never so pernicious, grosse
 or detestable) but pretends his way, doctrine, practise, opinions to be the way and truth
 of Christ, clayming their origination and descent from God, yea, * producing perver-
 ting the Scripture it selfe to justifie them, as the * Devill cited and wrested Scrip-
 ture to tempt Christ: yea, our Saviour and the Scripture informe us, that ma-
 ny false Teachers shall arise, and doe great Miracles, Signes and Wonders, inso-
 much that they shall deceive many, yea the greatest part of the World, and if it were
 possible the very Elest; * That Satan and his Ministers also transforme themselves
 into Angels of Light: That false Teachers usually come to seduce men in sheeps
 clothing, with all deceiveableness and craftines, whereby they lye in waite to deceive;
 and advise us frequently to beware of such, and not admit them into our houses, &c.
 And must we therefore not speedily oppose, resist, avoyd, suppress them or any of
 them now, because they thus pretend they are of and from God Himselfe, but if we
 will we see their condemnation written with a beame of the sun by the finger of God him-
 selfe, and will he hath disclaimed, renounced them from Heaven, by some visible judg-
 ment or destruction? If Arianisme, Pelagianisme, Socinianisme, Anabaptisme, or
 any

any anciently exploded *Hereses*, or *Schismes* should revive and sprout up among us (as some have lately done) should wee use such indulgence as this towards them, because they pretend *their origination and descent from heaven*; and their opinions not disputable only, but warranted by the Scripture? Alas what confusion, what inundation of heresies, schismes, and monstrous opinions would this presently introduce into our Church to its destruction, ruine, if such a Paradox were once admitted?

Secondly, Because it is contrary to these expresse precepts and presidents both of the Old and New Testament, which you may peruse at leasure, *Deut. 13. 1. to 18. Levit. 19. 17. Joshua. 22. 9. to 24. Psalme. 119. 104. 128. 2 Kings. 22. 8. to 27. Jer. 4. 30. 31. (a pregnant place) c. 14. 14. to 18. cap. 23. 13. to 23. cap. 27. 15. to 19. c. 29. 8, 9. Ezra. 13. throughout Matthew 7. 15. cap. 24. 11. 23. 24. 25. 26. Mark. 13. 5, 6. 22, 23, 24. Acts 13. 6. to 14. cap 15. 1. to 33. caps 17. 11. Rom. 16. 17. 18. 2 Cor. 11. 13. 14. 15. Galath. 1. 6, 7, 8, 9 10. c. 2. 4. to 18. (a noted place) c. 3. 1, 2, 3. Ephes. 4. 14. 15. Phil. 3. 1. 2. 3. Coloss. 2. 8. 18. to the end, 1 Thes. 5. 21. 2 Thes. 2. 1. to 16. c. 3. 6, 7. 1 Tim. 4. 1. to 7. chap. 1. 20. chap 5. 20 21, 22. 2 Tim. 2. 16. 17, 18. 23, 24, 25, 26. c. 4. 1. to 6. Titus. 1. 9. to 15. chapter 3. 9. 10, 11. 2 Pet. 2. 1, 2, 3. c. 3. 17. 18. 1 Ioh. 4. 2, 3. 2 John 10. 11. Jude 3. 4. &c. Revel. 2. 14. 15. 20, 21. compared together. (f) Paul would not give way to false Apostles [Gal. 2. 4. to 18] **NO NOT FOR AN HONORE**, that the truth of the Gospel might continue among the Galatians, and resisted Peter to his face, as soon as ever hee walked disorderly, and gave the least countenance to false Teachers, though a chiefe Apostle; and did not demur upon the matter; yea the Churches* of Pergamum, * Rom. 19. 15 and Thyatira, are sharply blamed for suffering some among them to hold the doctrine of Balaam, and the Nicolaitans; and to suffer Jesabell the Prophetesse to teach and seduce: And shall we permit them, now, without restraint?*

Thirdly, Because it is contrary to these received unquestionable Maximes of Divinitie, Politie, and Morality. *Principijs obstat: Venienti occurrere morbo*, to withstand the very beginnings of Errors, Heresies, Mischiefes, Schismes: to crush these Cockatrices in the shell; rather to keep then cast them out, *Turpius ejicitur quàm non admittitur hostis*. All wise men hold preventing Physicke best for their bodies, states, and why not for their souls and Churches? since, *Sero medicina paratur, cum mala per longas invaluerint moras*.

Fourthly, Because contrary to the (h) Policy, practise of most Godly Magistrates, Princes, Ministers, Churches in all Ages, Nations, which never indulged such liberty to opinions, new wayes, practises, especially to new Church-governments, Schismes, and Conventicles, (which he here pleads for) set up only by private spirits in opposition to the publick established Church-regelment. Indeed in some matters nearly of opinion which are not dangerous or schismaticall, some latitude may and must be left to men; but matters of Government are such tender things, as differences & varieties therein cannot be tollerated in one and the selfe same Church and State without infinite inconveniencies and disturbances, especially where every Church shall be Independent, subject to no other Canons, rules, but its own peculiar arbitrary Dictates..

2 It may be questioned, whether the Independent way he there so earnestly pleads for, be the way of Christ, or not? since he neither discovers to us what it is, nor produceth any one text to prove it *Christs own way*, nor one example to warrant it in any age: but gives us good grounds to suspect it none of his without much scrutiny.

- (i) Page 31. 1 For hrit, he coniecteth, (s) that *this way is every where spoken against, even by some that would be thought prime men and pillars in the temple of God; and insinuates; that the Parliament, Assembly and generality of the* (k) *Ministers and people of the Realm, are bent against it; Therefore being a new way, never yet heard off in the world in any age, or Church of Christ, and thus generally opposed by our whole Church and State even in these times of Reformation; we may* (l) *justly suspect it is no way of Christ, till we see its approbation written in a beam of the Sun with the finger of God himself, and till he hath justified and owned it as his, from heaven.*
- (k) See the London Ministers Petition against it.
- (l) See 1 Cor. 11. 16. c. 10. 32, 33.
- 2 He tacitly acknowledgeth, is a (m) *Government set up by a few private men, not only without, but against the authority & commands of the Parliament and supreme temporall Magistrates: yea, which not only denies but oppugnes the temporall Magistrates, Parliaments, Synods directions or coercive power in Ecclesiasticall affairs; directly contrary to the Scriptures, as I have largely proved by many Texts, in my* (n) *Independency examined.* Only I shall adde, that not only the Kings and temporall Magistrates of the Israelites; but even heathen (p) *Kings and Princes (as Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Darius, Nebuchadnezzar, the King & Nobles of Nineve &c.) enacted good and wholesome Laws, for the worship, honor and service of the true God, and to further his people in the building of his temple; who thereupon were enjoined to pray for their prosperity, as the marginall Scriptures evidence. Then, (r) Paul himselfe even in matters of Religion pleaded his cause before Festus, Felix, King Agrippa, and at last appealed unto Caesar an heathen Emperor, herein; yea he enjoyns all Christians (s) to pray even for heathen Kings Magistrates, and to submit to all their lawfull commands for conscience sake, to whose judicature and tribunals, (t) Christ himself and his Apostles willingly submitted themselves upon all occasions when brought before them, without demurring to their jurisdictions. Therefore Christian Princes & Magistrates who were long since predicted to become nursing Fathers to the Church under the Gospel, have much more power and jurisdiction in Church-government and affairs within their own Dominions.*
- (m) See p. 30. to 52.
- (n) P. 3, 4. 11. 12.
- (p) Ezra 1. 1. to the end.
- c. 17. to 24.
- c. 6. 2. to 17.
- c. 7. 12. to 28.
- Neh. 2. 1. to 47. a Chron. 36. 22, 23.
- Isay 44. 28.
- Dan. 3. 29. c. 6. 25, 26, 27.
- Jonah 3. 5, 6, 7.
- (q) Tim. 2. 1, 2. 19. 7.
- (r) Acts 24, 25, & 26, & 27, 28. 2 Tim. 4. 10. 17. (s).
- 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2.
3. Rom. 13. 1. to 7. Tit. 3. 1.
- (t) Matt. 10. 17, 18. 21. c. 26, 27.
- Amos 13. 9.
- c. 15. Acts 4. 1. to 24. c. 5. 17. to 4. c. 6. 22, 23. c. 9. 1, 2. 3. c. 11. 2, 3. 4. c. 16. 10. to 40. c. 18. 12.
- (v) Page 38. to 40.
- (x) P. 30. 31.
- (y) Amos 3. 3.
- 3 For that it appears to be away that will breed infinite confusions, disorders, by confounding (v) *the bounds of parishes, renting Congregations, families, and most relations assunder; & giving way to every sect to chuse Ministers, erect Churches of their own without controule, in point of position (thou h their practise be quite contrary where they have power, they admitting no other kind of government but Independency in New-England, and excommunicating, or banishing those who will not submit unto it;) a government inconsistent with Royalty, and the civill government; and so none of Christs, who never erected any Church-government to clasp with or controule the civill.*
- 4 Whereas he pretends, that (x) *persons of one family or parish may be members of severall Churches, without any inconvenience, schisme, or distraction; as well as members of severall companies and trades; and therefore Independency is no occasion of divisions.*
- I answer, 1. That (y) *two cannot walke peaceably and lovingly together, unless they are agreed, especially in matters of Religion; and those who in point of conscience cannot communicate or agree together in one Church, will never questionlesse accord well together in one family, bed, parish, kingdom, as experience manifestts.*
2. There is a great difference between severall trades and Hall in one City, parish, kingdome, and severall formes of Church-government, in these particulars which occasion unity in the one, but schismes in the others. 1. All trades societies hold one another lawfull, usefull, necessary, agreeable to the lawes of God and the Realme without

without dispute; & so they breed no contrariety of opinions or dissension: but each different Church deems the other unlawful, & in no way of Christ, so as they cannot with safe conscience joyn or communicate together: and thereupon they sever one from another. 2. Every severall trade and society, even in their very trade is subject to the general Government, Laws of the City & Realm wherein they are, to which they appeale and have recourse upon all occasions of difference, none craving an exemption or Independency from the whole Corporation, Parliament or supream Magistrate in matters which concern their government, but deriving their Corporations, Charters, Laws and priviledges from them: which subordination keeps them all in peace and unity. But Independent Churches deny any subordination, subjection to the Ecclesiasticall Lawes and Edicts of Parlements, of temporall Magistrates or Synods, and will be regulated, obliged onely by their own peculiar Edicts; which must needs occasion infinite Schismes, and disorders: therefore the cases are far different from one to the other.

Thirdly, Christians, as Christians, are all of one and the self-same society and profession, as those of one Trade or Calling are; therefore they should have all but one common Church and government, as these Trades have: To set then the comparison upright, we must state it thus; If some of one Fraternity in London (suppose the Merchant-sealers, Saddlers, Mercers, or the like) should fall out among themselves, and one would have one forme of government, another another, and thereupon divide themselves into severall conventicles and petty meetings in corners, not at their common hall, and one chuse one Government, Matter, or Warden, another another, and so sever the company, and continue independent; this (no doubt) would prove an apparent schisme, and seminary of infinite divisions; to the distraction, destruction of the whole Company and Fraternity. This is the true state of your *Independency*; yea Mr Goodwins present case in his own Parish, miserably divided, disordered by his *Independent way*: which hath induced him to refuse to administer the Lords Supper, (yea Baptisme to some children of Parishioners) for a yeares space or more, though they offer to be examined by him; esteeming them none of his Flocke, (preaching but seldome to them, though he receive their sithes:) and instead thereof to gather an *Independent congregation* to himselfe, out of divers Parishes and his owne, to whom hee prescribes a Covenant ere they be admitted members of it; preaching, praying, administering the Sacrament to them alone in private conventicles, neglecting his Parishioners: which hath engendred such discontents and rents in his Parish, even among the well-affected and truly religious, that he must either desert it or his *Independent way*. What schismes and discords this *New way* hath raised in other Parishes, is so well knowne to the World, that I need no other evidence to prove it a schismaticall *By-path*, and so no way of Christ the * Prince of peace, * who prescribes nought else but precepts of peace and unity to his Churches, and is most offended with their schismes.

Finallie, I cannot thinke this way a way of Christ, because I finde it a Pioneer and underminer of *Parliamentary authority*, devesting Parliaments of all manner of jurisdiction in matters of Religion and church-government; witness the passage of the *Two independent Brethren* recited in my *Independency examined* p. 3. (which certainly weares a *Mask* as yet, since she never appeared bare-faced to the world, not one of her Patrons hitherto presenting us with her

* Eia. 9. 6.
See my twelve
Questions p.
7, 8.

in her native colours, or lineaments) whose guilt this *Author* by his explanation, *to make it good*, rather aggravates then extenuates. He writes, "That the Brethren in the mentioned period and expressions, reflected onely upon the generalitie of the Land, who according to the Lawes, yea according to the principles of all reason and equitie have the right of nominating persons unto Parliamentarie trust and power, but HAVE NO AVTHORITY OR POWER FROM CHRIST TO NOMINATE OR APPOINT WHO SHALL BE THE MEN THAT SHALL ORDER THE AFFAIRES OF CHRISTS KINGDOME, OR INSTITVTE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS CHVRCHES: These are that secular root, out of which the Brethren conceive AN IMPOSSIBILITY that a spirituall extraction should be made; that is, THAT A LEGITIMATE ECCLESIASTICK POWER SHOULD ACCORDING TO THE MIND OF CHRIST, OR ANY PRECEPT OR PRESIDENT OF SCRIPTVRE, BEE BY THEM CONFERRED VPON ANY MAN. And this IMPOSSIBILITY conceived by them they onelie illustrate and declare by that parallel expression in *Job. Who can bring a cleane thing out of an uncleane? &c.* But to hold, that the persons so elected as hath been said, have a power by veltue of such nomination or election to enact Lawes and Statutes in matters of Religion, and to order under mulcts and penalties how men shall worship and serve God, as it is a meanes to awaken the eye of jealousie upon them, and so is seven times more destructive unto, and undermining not onlie of their power, but of their honour, peace, and safetie also, then any thing that is found in the way so ill intreated; so it is a setting of a power upon the electors of such persons, I meane the promiscuous multitude of the Land, yea of a greater power then ever Iesus Christ himselfe had, at least then ever he exercised; For as *dare Regem*, argues a greater power then *esse Regem*; as hee that buildeth an house hath more honour then the house, *Hebr. 3.3.* so to nominate and appoint who shall have power to umpire in matters of conscience and of God, to determine what shall be preached, and what not; what shall be beleaved, and what not, is a branch of a greater root of power, then the exercise of the power that is committed to others in this behalfe. Now though Iesus Christ had a power, and was authorized by God to be a Law-giver himselfe unto his Churches and Saints in their spirituall Republike, yet it is hard to prove, that he ever he invested any other with such a power: His Apostles themselves were no Lords over the faith of the Saints, nor had they anie power or authoritie to impose any thing upon men, as † necessarie either to be beleaved or practised, but what they had in expresse commission and charge from Iesus Christ himselfe to impose upon such termes, &c.

The summe of this large passage is, that there is not onelie an improbabilitie, but absolute impossibilitie, that the Parliament should have any power at all to enact Lawes and Statutes in matters of Religion, church-government, Gods worship or service, because the people who elect them have no such power, and so an impossibilitie of deriving any such authoritie to them; and to affirme the contrarie, is not onely to awake the eyes of jealousie upon them, but exceedingly destructive to, and undermining of not onely their power, but honour, peace, and safetie also. Whether this be not directly to undermine the

Note.
Gamaliell & your Text never taught you any such Anti-Parliamentary Doctrine.

Note.
* The people having power to elect Princes, Magistrates, Ministers, Parliament, Synods have likewise authority to nominate such who by the rule of Gods Word may limit these particulars, though not by their owne bare authority, without or against the Word.
† Every Magistrate, Parliament, and Synod, have power to declare and enjoin what is necessary to be beleaved, practised, by according to Gods Word, not without or contrary to it.

the authority of Parliaments and temporal Magistrates in all church-affairs and matters of Religion, contrarie to your late Covenant and Protestation, and that in the most transcendent manner that ever any have hitherto attempted in print, let all wise men judg: I am sorry such ill passages should fall from so good a pen.

But to give a short Answer to this *extravagant discourse*: First, this objection might be made against the *generall Assemblies, Parliaments, Kings of the Israelites, who [a] were chosen by the people*, yet they made Lawes and Statutes concerning Religion, and Gods worship, with his approbation, without any such exception, as I have elsewhere proved. Secondly, God himself (as I formerly touched) used the ministry, assistance of *Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Darius*, with other heathen Princes and Magistrates, for the building of his Temple, and advancement of his worship, for which they made *Decrees, Statutes*; notwithstanding this objected reason reflects more upon them and their electors, then on such who are Christians by external profession. Thirdly, most Christian Kings and Magistrates in the World, (even those who claime to be hereditary, as the yet continued formes of their Coronations and instalments manifest) come in by the peoples election, as well as such members of Parliament who are eligible, yet you cannot without disloyalty and absurdity, deny them authoritie in matters of Religion and Church-government. Fourthly, your selfe doe not onely grant, but argue, [b] *That every private man hath, yea ought to have power to elect and constitute his own Minister*: and no doubt you will grant, that private men have power likewise to set up independent Congregations, which have authority to prescribe such Covenants, Lawes, and Rules of Government, Discipline, Worship, as themselves think most agreeable to the Word: If then they may derive such an Ecclesiasticall authority to independent Ministers and Churches, why not as well to Parliaments and Synods likewise by the self-same reason? Fifthly, it is cleare by sundry instances in Scripture, and your owne Text, that God doth oft times make use of un sanctified persons, and the rude multitude, (whom you so much undervalue), to advance his glory, propagate his Gospel, promote his Worship, vindicate his Truth, and edifie his Church: He can poure a spirit of prophesie upon [c] a *Baalam*, a *Saul*, a *Gamaliel*, a persecuting High-Priest; he can make a [d] *Judas* an Apostle, yea send him to preach and build his Church, as well as a *Peter*: Wee read in the Evangelists, that none were so forward as the vulgar [e] multitude to believe, follow, profess Christ, and embrace the Gospel, though many of them did it out of sinister ends. Therefore they may well have power to chuse such persons who shall and may make Lawes to promote the Gospel, and Government of the Church of Christ. Sixthly, those who have no skill at all in Law, Physick, or Architecture, have yet judgment, and reason enough to make choice of the best Lawyers, Physicians, Architects, when they need their help. Those who are unfit, or unable to be members of Parliament themselves, (as most of the electors are) have yet had wisdom enough in all ages, and especially at this present, to elect the most eminent & ablest men for such a service: Those who are unmeet to be Kings, Magistrates, Commanders, or Ministers, have yet skill enough to chuse able persons for such offices: & power to delegate to them such Parliamentary, Royall, Magisteriall, Pastorall authority, as is necessary for their severall offices, which those who elected them never had actually, but onely originally or virtually in them, not to use, but derive them unto others: why then may not our free-holders, who

a See my Appendix to the
soveraigne
power of Par-
liaments and
Kingdomes p.
122. to 131.
† Twelve con-
siderable Que-
ries p. 4, 5. In-
dependency
examined p.
2, 17, 122.

b Page 25, 26

c Num. 22. 35.
c. 23, & 24.
1 Sam. 10.
Ag. 5. 34. to
40. Joh. 11. 49,
10 53.
d Ioh. 6. 70, 71
Mar. 6. 7. to 14.
e Matth. 5. 1.
c. 13. 1, 2. c. 8.
19. c. 9. 36. c.
14 14; 19. c.
11. 32, 33. c. 21
8, 9; 10. Luk.
6. 17, 19. c. 8.
44, 45. Joh. 6.
2, 5. Mar. 12.
12, 37. Luk. 13
17. c. 18. 43. c.
21. 38. c. 22. 1.
Joh. 7. 40. 43.
&c. c. 8. 2.
Ag. 2. 47.

have.

have voices in electing the members of our Parliaments, and the Commonalty of the Land, (whom you scandalously terme, *the vilest and most unworthy of men*, though there be a degree of vulgar people viler and unworthier then they in all respects, who have no votes in such elections) have sufficient authority in them to elect and nominate such fitt persons, who by virtue of such nomination or election shall have right and power to enact Lawes, Statutes, in matters of Religion, Worship, and Church-government, not dissonant from Gods Word, to which themselves and others by Gods owne ordinance must submit: If the common people, who neither are nor can be Parliaments, Emperors, Kings, Judges, Magistrates, Ministers have yet a lawful power to make others such by their bare election, & so give them such authority and power as themselves never actually were or can be possessors of, then why by the self same reason may they not likewise delegate a law full Ecclesiasticall legislative authority in church-affairs, to their elected Parliamentary and Synodall Members, which was never actually in themselves, as well as Mr *Goodwin* delegate the power of determining who should be fitt persons to receive the Sacrament, and to become members of his independent Congregation, to eight select substitutes, which was never actually vested in himselfe, nor transferable thus to others by any Law of God or man?

* This he confessed, and it appeared by a writing before the Committee of plundered Ministers.

* Or as well as himselfe, extracts many spirituall Doctrines out of Gamaliels secular speech in these very sermons.

(*) Therefore your principall Argument; that the seven particular Churches in Asia had no Jurisdiction one over another, (being under different civil Dominions, and not members of the selfe same Christian Republicke,) & yet the whole Parliament and Church of England have no Jurisdiction over particular parish Churches, or Independent Congregations in England; is a mere *Independency*.

(contrary to your Paradox) as well as a *Regall, Magistrall, Parliamentall, Ministeriall* extraction, out of a meere popular or servile root: or the best strong waters out of the vilest Lees; the richest Minerals out of the coarsest earth; the most orient Pearles out of the basest Oysters? In one word, the very choice of *your vilest and most unworthy of men*, have made this Parliament, may for ever resolve this childish reason, the corner-stone of your *Independent fabricke*, litted together with independent doctrines, unable to abide the test. Therefore notwithstanding this your reason, our present Parliament may and ought in point of right & duty, to make binding Lawes for regulating church-government, restraining heresies, schismes, innovations, erroneous doctrines, unlawfull conventicles, and for settling the purity of Gods worship and Religion, notwithstanding this objection; and with as much reason, justice, raise, and establish a new church-government, suitable to Gods Word and the civil State, as reforme or repeale the old, (which grew to burdensome and offensive) till Independents can shew us better grounds against it then any yet produced: and informe us, why our whole representative Church and State should not of right enjoy and exercise as great or greater ecclesiasticall jurisdiction, over all particular persons and Churches who are Members of our Church and Realm, as any Independent Minister or Congregation challenge or usurp unto themselves, over their owne Members, (this being the true state of the question, and not whether *one particular Church, or parish, have superiority or jurisdiction over another*, as you insist to, by *drawing* yet againe both Law & Gospel for ought they yet have made appeare: I shall by no more in so clear a case, but refer the Author to the high Court of Parliament, (whose undoubted privileges he hath presumptuously undermined by the very roots) to erase their *Barren*, or undergoe their *owne* faults and other his *owne* *particular* *any* passages, diametrically contrary to his *owne* *their* late *Narrative* *and* *Covenant*, which they cannot without *high* *perjury* permit any such thing to be violate in the most publike manner.

FINIS.